



## UNITED STATES PATENT AND TRADEMARK OFFICE

UNITED STATES DEPARTMENT OF COMMERCE  
United States Patent and Trademark Office  
Address: COMMISSIONER FOR PATENTS  
P.O. Box 1450  
Alexandria, Virginia 22313-1450  
[www.uspto.gov](http://www.uspto.gov)

APPLICATION NO.	FILING DATE	FIRST NAMED INVENTOR	ATTORNEY DOCKET NO.	CONFIRMATION NO.
10/678,214	10/06/2003	Hideki Nakamura	117454	2386
25944	7590	09/09/2009	EXAMINER	
OLIFF & BERRIDGE, PLC P.O. BOX 320850 ALEXANDRIA, VA 22320-4850			SHEPARD, JUSTIN E	
ART UNIT	PAPER NUMBER			
	2424			
MAIL DATE	DELIVERY MODE			
09/09/2009	PAPER			

Please find below and/or attached an Office communication concerning this application or proceeding.

The time period for reply, if any, is set in the attached communication.

<b>Interview Summary</b>	<b>Application No.</b> 10/678,214	<b>Applicant(s)</b> NAKAMURA ET AL.
	<b>Examiner</b> Justin E. Shepard	<b>Art Unit</b> 2424

All participants (applicant, applicant's representative, PTO personnel):

(1) Justin E. Shepard. (3) Kip Kerking.

(2) Mike Steger. (4) \_\_\_\_\_.

Date of Interview: 01 September 2009.

Type: a) Telephonic b) Video Conference  
c) Personal [copy given to: 1) applicant 2) applicant's representative]

Exhibit shown or demonstration conducted: d) Yes e) No.  
If Yes, brief description: \_\_\_\_\_.

Claim(s) discussed: 1 and 13.

Identification of prior art discussed: Stumphauzer.

Agreement with respect to the claims f) was reached. g) was not reached. h) N/A.

Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was agreed to if an agreement was reached, or any other comments: The applicant argued that the last portion of the claim taught that a list of search results was presented to a user, but upon discussing the specification, the applicant and examiner agreed that support for this was not found in the specification. The examiner agreed that if the applicant finds support for this in the specification upon further search, that the search result presenting limitation would get around Stumphauzer.

(A fuller description, if necessary, and a copy of the amendments which the examiner agreed would render the claims allowable, if available, must be attached. Also, where no copy of the amendments that would render the claims allowable is available, a summary thereof must be attached.)

THE FORMAL WRITTEN REPLY TO THE LAST OFFICE ACTION MUST INCLUDE THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. (See MPEP Section 713.04). If a reply to the last Office action has already been filed, APPLICANT IS GIVEN A NON-EXTENDABLE PERIOD OF THE LONGER OF ONE MONTH OR THIRTY DAYS FROM THIS INTERVIEW DATE, OR THE MAILING DATE OF THIS INTERVIEW SUMMARY FORM, WHICHEVER IS LATER, TO FILE A STATEMENT OF THE SUBSTANCE OF THE INTERVIEW. See Summary of Record of Interview requirements on reverse side or on attached sheet.

/Christopher Kelley/ Supervisory Patent Examiner, Art Unit 2424
--